UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,146	12/07/2001	Takeo Miyazawa	111392	8118

25944 7590 09/08/2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER	
TRUONG, LAN DAI T	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2143	

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/005,146	MIYAZAWA, TAKEO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	lan dai thi truong	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *03* MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 December 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *08/09/02; 05/09/02*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim rejections-35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The applicant claims: "an image server that receives image data from said server and/or said mobile terminal and stores the received data in said image memory..." The examiner does not clearly understand the relationship between "an image server" and "said server." For examination purpose, the examiner assumes "image server" means "collection server", and "said server" means "said servers."

Claim rejections-35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or descry bed as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1) Claims 1-4, 9-16, 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Chow et al. (U.S. 6,029,175) in view of LaRue et al. (U.S. 6,810,405)

Regarding to claims 1, 13-16 and 20-24:

Chow discloses the invention substantially as claimed for synchronizing communication between a server and mobile stations, comprising:

A collection conditions memory that pre-stores the conditions for collecting contents: (Chow discloses a Revision Manager maintains "a cache system" which is equivalent to "a collection conditions memory," wherein a user provides "a resource such as URLs and the port number on the user' local machine," those are equivalent to "pre-stores the conditions." Based on those provided conditions the Revision Manager can retrieve update information for the user: column 3, lines 65-67; column 4, lines 1-40, 60-65)

An information collection portion that accesses servers based on said collection conditions, collects the contents of said servers, and distributes the collected contents to a mobile terminal: (Chow discloses the Revision Manager is an intermediary between browsers and a servers. the Revision Manager automatically retrieves updated files from remote servers and deliveries them to browsers: abstract, lines 1-21; column 3, lines 65-67; column 4, lines 1-40, 60-65; column 5, lines 1-67; column 9, lines 33-38)

However, Chow does not explicitly teach a conversion portion that converts the collected contents into a format for said mobile terminal; and wherein said information collection portion contains a synchronization portion for synchronizing contents between itself and said mobile terminal every time contents are updated

LaRue discloses "a format gateway" which is equivalent to "a conversion portion" which configured to convert contents into appropriate formats for communication between sync server and wireless devices, see (LaRue: column 7, lines 47-67; column 8, lines 1-67)

LaRue also discloses synchronization process between the sync server and the wireless devices. Although LaRue does not explicitly disclose there is a synchronization portion in format gateway; however this feature is deemed to be inherent to the LaRue's system to operate the synchronization process between sync server and wireless device, see (LaRue: column 7, lines 47-67; column 8, lines 1-67).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine LaRue's ideas of synchronization the communication between the sync server with the wireless devices with Chow's system in order to provide a system and method that are efficient, cost-effective, and convenient for the user that work within the processing, storage and upgrade limitations of a wireless device, and that will work effectively and reliably in a wireless environment (LaRue: column 2, lines 65-67; column 3, lines 1-5)

Regarding to claim 4, which is exemplary with claim 19:

In addition to rejection in claims 2 and 16, Chow - LaRue further discloses wherein said pointer includes at least one of information showing the storage location of the original image and information showing the storage location of the image for a mobile terminal: (Chow discloses the Revision Manager used as the intermediary between the browsers and the servers. If the files in server are modified, the Revision Manager will updates new versions to the browsers. Although Chow does not explicitly disclose there is pointer to allocate storage location for updating data; however this feature is deemed to be inherent to the Chow's system: column 10, lines 1-67; column 11, lines 1-17)

Regarding to claim 2, which is exemplary with claim 3:

In addition to rejection in claim 1, Chow - LaRue further discloses:

An image memory that stores image data: (Chow discloses Revision Manager maintains a "cache" which is equivalent to "image memory" to cache "updated documents" which is equivalent to "image data": column 11, lines 18-34)

A mobile terminal image memory that stores image data for said mobile terminal: (LaRue discloses the synchronization communication between the sync server and the wireless devices. Although LaRue does not explicitly disclose a wireless device's memory; however this feature is deemed to be inherent to the LaRue's system in order to operate the communication, see (LaRue: column 2, lines 65-67; column 3, lines 1-5).

An image server that receives image data from said server and/or said mobile terminal and stores the received data in said image memory, converts said image data into an image for said mobile terminal, and stores the converted data in said mobile terminal image memory, wherein said information collection portion generates a pointer of said image data and/or said mobile terminal image data, and transmits the generated pointer to said mobile terminal: (LaRue discloses the synchronization process between the sync server and the wireless devices. Also he discloses "a format gateway" which is equivalent to "a conversion portion" that configured to convert contents into appropriate formats for the communication between the sync server and the wireless devices, see (LaRue: column 2, lines 65-67; column 3, lines 1-5).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine LaRue's ideas of synchronization communication between sync server with wireless device with Chow's system in order to provide a system and method that are efficient, cost-effective, and convenient for the user that work within the processing, storage and

upgrade limitations of a wireless device, and that will work effectively and reliably in a wireless environment (LaRue: column 2, lines 65-67; column 3, lines 1-5)

Regarding to claims 9-12:

In addition to rejection in claim 1, Chow - LaRue further discloses wherein said collection conditions include at least a URL (Universal Resource Locator) and a portion of the HTML (Hypertext Markup Language) source of the home page specified by said URL: (Chow discloses the user provides a resource such as URLs and the port number on the user' local machine to the Revision Manager: column 3, lines 65-67; column 4, lines 1-40, 60-65)

2) Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Chow - LaRue in view of Dutcher et al. (U.S. 6,209,032)

Regarding to claim 8:

Chow - LaRue discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claim 5, but does not explicitly teach wherein said synchronization portion notifies said generation number in predetermined time intervals

However, Dutcher discloses a process of synchronization updating information between a central server and user accounts. In Dutcher's system, data is "frequently updated" which is shared functionality with "synchronization in predetermined time interval" between the central server and the user accounts, see (Dutcher: column 8, lines 42-55)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Dutcher's ideas of synchronization with Chow - LaRue's system in order to frequently update information between central server and users, see (Dutcher: column 8, lines 42-55)

3) Claims 5-7 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being un-patentable over Chow - LaRue in view of Kucala (U.S. 6,243,705)

Regarding to claim 5-7, which is exemplary with claims 17-18:

Chow - LaRue discloses the invention substantially as disclosed in claims 1 and 16, Chow - LaRue teach synchronization updating information between sync server and wireless device, and using format gate to convert content format into appropriate format for communication between sync server and wireless device, but they do not explicitly teach the process of synchronization updating information such as wherein said synchronization portion sets a generation number showing the state of contents and/or message, and updates said generation number at least in one of the cases of said information collection portion receiving new contents and/or messages, the contents and/or message in said information collection portion being corrected, and the contents and/or message in said information collection portion being deleted, and wherein said mobile terminal receives said generation number, and when the received generation number differs from the previously received generation number, sends a demand to said synchronization portion for transfer of contents and/or message

However, Kucala discloses a method and apparatus for synchronized updating information between two different compute systems. Kucala discloses the method of comparing data records to determine which one is new record, which one is updated record and which one is deleted record for processing the synchronized updating information based on those collected information, see (Kucala: page 2, lines 10-27)

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Kucala's ideas of synchronized updating information between

two computer systems with Chow - LaRue's system in order to reconcile database files on a palmtop with corresponding database file on a PC, see (Kucala: abstract, lines 5-8)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to lan dai thi truong whose telephone number is 571-272-7959. The examiner can normally be reached on monday- friday from 8:30am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lan Dai Thi Truong
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

Ldt
09/02/2005

DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100